



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,408	05/05/2006	Isao Suzuki	Q94708	1650
23373	7590	07/07/2010	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			ARCIERO, ADAM A	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			1795	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/07/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/578,408	SUZUKI ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
ADAM A. ARCIERO	1795	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 June 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 12-18.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/Dah-Wei D. Yuan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795

/Adam A Arciero/
Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's principal arguments are:

- a) Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case for the feature "at least the part of said non-coated portion is exposed on a surface of said power generating element, and the exposed part of said non-coated portion is covered with said cover member (claim 12)."
- b) Hanafusa does not teach a sealant layer and a cover member that are present between an aluminum foil and a power generating element and whereint eh cover member is a part which is separate from the battery case, and Examiner fails to provide a reasoning for using Hanafusa (claim 17).
- c) Examiner does not state which position of Fig. 3 in Lake corresponds to the non-coated portion (claim 16).

In response to Applicant's arguments, please consider the following comments.

a) The Examiner did establish a prima facie case for the limitation described above in the last Office action. Terehara et al. was used to modify Komatsu's battery by teaching that the end parts of the anode and cathode comprise non-coated portions to which terminal leads are welded to (col. 10, lines 30-46). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the electrodes of Komatsu, so that the end portions are provided with non-coated portions, because Terahara et al. teaches that the terminal leads can be welded to said non-coated portions and an emergence of current can be delivered from the battery. Since the whole battery of Komatsu is covered by the cover member, the non-coated portions are also covered by the cover member. The non-coated portions are exposed on a surface of the power generating element where the leads are attached. The terminal lead of Komatsu is attached to an end of the power generating element, not the middle of the power generating element, and Terahara et al. teaches that the ends of the electrodes comprise non-coated portions so that terminal leads may be welded to create a path for current to exit the battery system for use with an application.

b) Claim 17 does not require that the battery cover has to be separate from the battery case. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., cover member is completely separate from the battery case) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, Komatsu and Terahara teach the main structure of claim 17. Hanafusa was used to substitute a slightly differently structured cover member for the cover member of Komatsu and Terahara. The cover members of Hanafusa are structurally and materially the same as that of Komatsu. It would have been obvious to substitute one cover member for another as it would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

c) Lake was not used to teach the non-coated portion limitation. Terahara et al. was used to teach that the ends of the electrodes comprise non-coated portions so that the terminal leads can be welded thereto. Therefore, the ends of the electrodes in Fig. 3, where the terminal leads are attached, are where the non-coated portions can be found. Therefore, the superposed portions of the two cover members faces the non-coated ends of the electrodes, where the terminal lead is welded thereto. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).